

Remarks

The Office Action dated June 4, 2003 has been carefully reviewed and the foregoing amendment has been made in consequence thereof.

Claims 1-5, 8-11, 13-15, and 17-23 are pending in this application. Claims 1-4, 6, 9-11, 13, 16, and 20-23 stand rejected. Claims 5, 7, 8, 12, 14, 15, and 17-19 stand objected to. Claims 6, 7, 12, and 16 have been cancelled.

Submitted herewith for approval are three (3) sheets of formal drawings containing Figures 1-4.

The rejection of Claims 1, 6, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blocquel et al. (US 5,268,550) in view of Yokoi et al. (JP 2001-219,317) and further in view of Webb (US 3,390,247) is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the recitations of allowable Claim 7. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 1 is allowable and, therefore, patentable over Blocquel et al., Yokoi et al., and Webb, alone or in combination.

Claims 6 and 16 have been canceled.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 103(a) rejection of Claims 1, 6, and 16 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 2 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blocquel et al. (US 5,268,550) in view of Yokoi et al. (JP 2001-219,317), further in view of Webb (US 3,390,247), and still further in view of Clark et al. (US 5,408,883) is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the recitations of allowable Claim 7. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 1 is allowable and, therefore, patentable over Blocquel et al., Yokoi et al., Webb, and Clark et al., alone or in combination.

Claims 2 and 3 depend from independent Claim 1. When the recitations of dependent Claims 2 and 3 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2 and 3 likewise are patentable over Blocquel et al., Yokoi et al., Webb, and Clark et al., alone or in combination.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 103(a) rejection of Claims 2 and 3 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blocquel et al. (US 5,268,550) in view of Yokoi et al. (JP 2001-219,317), further in view of Webb (US 3,390,247), and still further in view of Burns et al. (US ,672,162) is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the recitations of allowable Claim 7. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 1 is allowable and, therefore, patentable over Blocquel et al., Yokoi et al., Webb, and Burns et al., alone or in combination.

Claim 4 depends from independent Claim 1. When the recitations of dependent Claim 4 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 4 likewise is patentable over Blocquel et al., Yokoi et al., Webb, and Burns et al., alone or in combination.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 103(a) rejection of Claim 4 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 9-11, 13, and 20-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blocquel et al. (US 5,268,550) in view of Yokoi et al. (JP 2001-219,317), further in view of Webb (US 3,390,247), and still further in view of Lamoureux (US 6,197,188) is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the recitations of allowable Claim 7, Claim 10 has been amended to include the recitations of allowable Claim 12, and allowable Claim 17 has been rewritten in independent format. Accordingly, Applicants submit that independent Claims 1, 10, and 17 are allowable and, therefore, patentable over Blocquel et al., Yokoi et al., Webb, and Lamoureux, alone or in combination.

Claim 9 depends from independent Claim 1, Claims 11 and 13 depend from independent Claim 10, and Claims 20-21 depend from independent Claim 17. When the recitations of dependent Claim 9, dependent Claims 11 and 13, and dependent Claims 20-21 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claims 1, 10, and 17 respectively, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 9-11, 13, and 20-21 likewise are patentable over Blocquel et al., Yokoi et al., Webb, and Lamoureux, alone or in combination.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 103(a) rejection of Claims 9-11, 13, and 20-21 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 22 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blocquel et al. (US 5,268,550) in view of Yokoi et al. (JP 2001-219,317), further in view of Webb (US 3,390,247), and still further in view of Bell (US 4,071,729) is respectfully traversed.

Allowable Claim 17 has been rewritten in independent format. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 17 is allowable and, therefore, patentable over Blocquel et al., Yokoi et al., Webb, and Bell, alone or in combination.

Claims 22 and 23 depend from independent Claim 17. When the recitations of dependent Claims 22 and 23 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 17, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 22 and 23 likewise are patentable over Blocquel et al., Yokoi et al., Webb, and Bell, alone or in combination.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 103(a) rejection of Claims 22 and 23 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is respectfully traversed.

Independent Claims 1 and 10 have been amended. Applicants submit that as a result of said amendment, Claims 9 and 10 differ in scope and are definite and particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as their invention.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 112 rejection of Claims 9 and 10 be withdrawn.

The objection to Claims 5, 7, 8, 12, 14, 15, and 17-19 as being allowable but being dependent upon a rejected base claim is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the recitations of allowable Claim 7, Claim 10 has been amended to include the recitations of allowable Claim 12, and allowable Claim 17 has been rewritten in independent format. Accordingly, Applicants submit that independent Claims 1, 10, and 17 are allowable.

Claims 7, 12 and 16 have been canceled.

Claims 5 and 8 depend from independent Claim 1, Claims 14-15 depend from independent Claim 10, and Claims 18-19 depend from independent Claim 17. When the recitations of dependent Claims 5 and 8, dependent Claims 14-15, and dependent Claims 18-19 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claims 1, 10, and 17 respectively, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 5, 8, 12, 14, 15, and 18-19 likewise are allowable.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to Claims 5, 7, 8, 12, 14, 15, and 17-19 be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Michael Tersillo", written in black ink. The signature is fluid and stylized, with the first and last names being clearly legible.

---

Michael Tersillo  
Registration No. 42,180  
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP  
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600  
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740  
(314) 621-5070